UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,432	04/16/2004	Tomoe Ozasa	008312-0309252	9893

909 7590 12/15/2006

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER	
JOHNSON, CARLTON	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2136	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/825,432	OZASA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carlton Johnson	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 April 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 April 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4-16-2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responding to application papers filed **6-14-2004**.

2. Claims **1 - 13** are pending. Claims **1, 6, 7, 11** are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102(e) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims **1, 6, 7, 8, 11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Stefik et al.** (US Patent No. **5,638,443**).

Regarding Claim 1, Stefik discloses a content transmission device, which is capable of inputting contents including copy control information and outputting the contents, comprising:

a) a copy control information detection unit configured to detect the copy control information from the inputted contents; (see Stefik col. 3, lines 58-63: detect and access attached usage rights (i.e. copy control information) for media content)

b) a copy control information judgment unit configured to judge whether or not it is possible to output the contents from the detected copy control information; (see Stefik col. 5, lines 54-60; col. 6, lines 35-42: determinate usage rights (i.e. copy control information), allow output of media content)

c) a content output control unit configured to control the contents in an output failure state in a case where it is judged that the output of the contents is impossible; (see Stefik col. 6, lines 35-42: error condition (i.e. output failure state) based on usage rights (i.e. copy control information), control the contents - stop the session, contents not output) and

d) an output failure information output unit configured to output failure information indicating that the contents are in the output failure state instead of the contents controlled in the output failure state by the content output control unit. (see Stefik col. 9, lines 65-67: status, history and contents information; col. 16, lines 50-52: user interface for status (i.e. error condition) messages)

Regarding Claim 6, Stefik discloses a content transmission method, which is capable of inputting contents including copy control information and outputting the contents, comprising:

a) detecting the copy control information from the inputted contents; (see Stefik col. 3, lines 58-63: detect and access attached usage rights (i.e. copy control information) for content)

b) judging whether or not it is possible to output the contents from the detected copy control information; (see Stefik col. 5, lines 54-60; col. 6, lines 35-42: determinate usage rights (i.e. copy control information), allow output of contents)

c) controlling the contents in an output failure state in a case where it is judged that the output of the contents is impossible; (see Stefik col. 6, lines 35-42: error condition (i.e. output failure state) based on usage rights (i.e. copy control information), control the contents - stop the session, contents not output) and

d) outputting output failure information indicating that the contents are in the output failure state instead of the contents controlled in the output failure state. (see Stefik col. 9, lines 65-67: status information and contents; col. 16, lines 50-52: user interface)

Regarding Claim 7, Stefik discloses a content reception device in which contents are inputted and subjected to predetermined signal processing, comprising:

a) an output failure information extraction unit configured to extract output failure information added based on copy control information from the inputted contents; (see Stefik col. 16, lines 50-52; col. 9, lines 65-67: status (i.e. error message) information extracted for display, usage rights (i.e. status, history information))

b) an output failure information judgment unit configured to judge the extracted output failure information; (see Stefik col. 5, lines 54-60; col. 6, lines 35-42: determinate usage rights (i.e. status, copy control information), enable output of media contents) and

c) an output failure information notification unit configured to notify that the contents are in an output failure state based on a judgment result of the output failure information judgment unit. (see Stefik col. 9, lines 65-67: status information and contents; col. 16, lines 50-52: user interface for status display)

Regarding Claim 8, Stefik discloses a content reception device according to claim 7, wherein the output failure information extraction unit is configured to:

a) extract the output failure information added based on the copy control information from a plurality of types of contents which differ with type, (see Stefik col. 16, lines 50-52; col. 9, lines 65-67: error message information extracted for display, usage rights (i.e. status, history information); col. 10, lines 62-63: multiple types of media content processed)

b) the output failure information judgment unit is configured to judge a content of the output failure information extracted from the plurality of types of contents, (see Stefik col. 5, lines 54-60; col. 6, lines 35-42: determinate usage rights (i.e. copy control information) enable output of contents; col. 10, lines 62-63: multiple types of media content processed) and

c) the output failure information notification unit is configured to notify the contents in the output failure state based on judgment results of the output failure information judgment unit. (see Stefik col. 9, lines 65-67: status information and contents; col. 16, lines 50-52: user interface for display)

Regarding Claim 11, Stefik discloses a content reception method in which a plurality of types of contents different in system are inputted and each of the contents is subjected to predetermined signal processing, comprising:

a) extracting output failure information added based on copy control information from the inputted plurality of types of contents; (see Stefik col. 9, lines 65-67: status (i.e. output failure information) combined with contents; col. 10, lines 62-63: multiple types of media content processed)

b) judging a content of the extracted output failure information; (see Stefik col. 5, lines 54-60; col. 6, lines 35-42: determinate usage rights (i.e. status, copy control information), enable output of media contents) and

c) notifying the contents brought in an output failure state based on a judgment result of the output failure information. (see Stefik col. 9, lines 65-67: status information and contents; col. 16, lines 50-52: user interface for status display)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim **2** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Stefik** in view of **Salmonsen et al.** (US PGPUB **200300220781**).

Regarding Claim 2, Stefik discloses a content transmission device according to claim 1, wherein output failure information output unit, and to output the output failure information. (see Stefik col. 3, lines 58-63: media content and control information delivery system; col. 6, lines 41-42: error condition processing via messages; col. 16, lines 50-52: user interface for status (i.e. output status information) display) Stefik does not specifically disclose wherein the output information is configured to add the output failure information to VBI of an analog video signal. However, Salmonsen discloses wherein the output information is configured to add the output failure information to VBI of an analog video signal. (see Salmonsen paragraph [0100], lines 14-16: streaming media processing; paragraph [0109], lines 7-13: header processing; paragraph [0184], lines 9-13; paragraph [0188], lines 1-3: analog signal processing; paragraph [0186], lines 3-6; paragraph [0188], lines 7-10: VBI (Vertical Blanking Interval) processing)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stefik as taught by Salmonsen to enable the capability to utilize analog signal and VBI (Vertical Blanking Interval) communications. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Salmonsen in order to achieve a level of interoperability and resource management among network-connected devices. (see Salmonsen paragraph [0003], lines 4-11: *" ... networks enable easy access to information throughout the world and facilitate information delivery world-wide in the form of text files, data, motion pictures, video clips, web pages, flash presentations, shareware, computer programs, command files, and other information. One obstacle to*

access and delivery of information is lack of interoperability and resource management among devices. ... ")

7. Claims **3 - 5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Stefik** in view of **Salmonsen et al.** (US PGPUB **200300220781**) and further in view of **Adent et al.** (US PGPUB No. **20040054912**).

Regarding Claim 3, Stefik discloses a content transmission device according to claim 1, wherein the output failure information output unit, and to output the output failure information. (see Stefik col. 3, lines 58-63: media content and control information delivery system; col. 6, lines 41-42: error condition processing via messages; col. 16, lines 50-52: user interface for status (i.e. output status information) display) Stefik does not specifically disclose output information is configured to add the output failure information to an isochronous packet of IEEE 1394 digital video data. However, Salmonsen discloses wherein output information is configured to add the output failure information to an isochronous packet of IEEE 1394 digital video data. (see Salmonsen paragraph [0100], lines 14-16: streaming media processing; paragraph [0109], lines 7-13: header processing; paragraph [0184], lines 9-13; paragraph [0035], lines 4-13: CIP headers, IEEE 1394 protocols)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stefik as taught by Salmonsen to enable the capability to add the output failure information to an isochronous packet of IEEE 1394 digital video data. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Salmonsen in order to achieve a high level of interoperability and resource management among network-connected devices. (see Salmonsen paragraph [0003], lines 4-11)

Stefik-Salmonsen does not specifically disclose wherein to add the output failure information to a CIP header. However, Adent discloses wherein to add the output failure information to a CIP header. (see Adent paragraph [0002], lines 2-4; paragraph [0004], lines 1-3; paragraph [0019], lines 1-5: header (i.e. CIP header) modification capability)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stefik as taught by Adent to enable the capability to add the output failure information to a CIP header. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Adent in order to enable delivery of streaming data over a wide variety of networks and protocols. (see Adent paragraph [0003], lines 5-7)

Regarding Claim 4, Stefik discloses a content transmission device according to claim 1, wherein the output failure information output unit, and to output the output failure information. (see Stefik col. 3, lines 58-63: media content and control information delivery system; col. 6, lines 41-42: error condition processing via messages; col. 16, lines 50-52: user interface for status (i.e. output status information) display) Stefik does not specifically disclose to add the output failure information to digital video data outputted by RTP via Ethernet. However, Salmonsen disclose wherein output information is configured to add the output failure information to digital video data

outputted by RTP via Ethernet. (see Salmonsen paragraph [0100], lines 14-16: streaming media processing; paragraph [0109], lines 7-13: header processing; paragraph [0184], lines 9-13; paragraph [0035], lines 4-13: RTP protocols)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stefik as taught by Salmonsen to configured to add the output failure information to digital video data outputted by RTP via Ethernet. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Salmonsen in order to achieve a high level of interoperability and resource management among network-connected devices. (see Salmonsen paragraph [0003], lines 4-11)

Stefik-Salmonsen does not specifically disclose wherein to add the output failure information to an RTP extension header. However, Adent discloses wherein to add the output failure information to an RTP extension header. (see Adent paragraph [0002], lines 2-4; paragraph [0004], lines 1-3; paragraph [0019], lines 1-5: header (i.e. RTP extension header) modification capability)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stefik as taught by Adent to enable the capability to add the output failure information to an RTP extension header. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Adent in order to enable delivery of streaming data over a wide variety of networks and protocols. (see Adent paragraph [0003], lines 5-7)

Regarding Claim 5, Stefik discloses a content transmission device according to claim 1, wherein the output failure information output unit, and to output the output failure

information. (see Stefik col. 3, lines 58-63: media content and control information delivery system; col. 6, lines 41-42: error condition processing via messages; col. 16, lines 50-52: user interface for status (i.e. output status information) display) Stefik does not specifically disclose output information is configured to add the output failure information to digital video data outputted by HTTP via Ethernet. However, Salmonsen disclose wherein output information is configured to add the output failure information to digital video data outputted by HTTP via Ethernet. (see Salmonsen paragraph [0100], lines 14-16: streaming media processing; paragraph [0109], lines 7-13: header processing; paragraph [0184], lines 9-13; paragraph [0035], lines 4-13: HTTP protocols)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stefik as taught by Salmonsen to configured to add the output failure information to data outputted by HTTP via Ethernet. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Salmonsen in order to achieve a high level of interoperability and resource management among network-connected devices. (see Salmonsen paragraph [0003], lines 4-11)

Stefik-Salmonsen does not specifically disclose wherein to add the output failure information to an HTTP header. However, Adent discloses wherein to add the output failure information to an HTTP header. (see Adent paragraph [0002], lines 2-4; paragraph [0004], lines 1-3; paragraph [0019], lines 1-5: header modification capability)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stefik as taught by Adent to enable the capability to add the output failure information to an HTTP header. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the

teachings of Adent in order to enable delivery of streaming data over a wide variety of networks and protocols. (see Adent paragraph [0003], lines 5-7)

8. Claims **9, 10, 12, 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Stefik** in view of **Lee et al.** (US PGPUB No. **20030115146**).

Regarding Claim 9, Stefik discloses a content reception device, method according to claims 7 or 8. (see Stefik col. 3, lines 58-63: media content and control information delivery system; col. 6, lines 41-42: error condition processing via messages) Stefik does not specifically disclose a content recording unit configured to record the inputted contents, and an output failure information recording unit configured to record the judgment result of the output failure information judgment unit in accordance with the contents recorded in the content recording unit.

However, Lee discloses:

a) a content recording unit configured to record the inputted contents; (see Lee paragraph [0215], lines 2-6; paragraph [0221], lines 1-5; paragraph [367], lines 16-17: record capability for media content) and

b) an output failure information recording unit configured to record the judgment result of the output failure information judgment unit in accordance with the contents recorded in the content recording unit. (see Lee paragraph [0453], lines 10-13: error procedure utilizing messaging, error message displayed)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stefik as taught by Lee to enable the capability for a content recording unit configured to record the inputted contents, and an output failure information recording unit configured to record the judgment result of the output failure information judgment unit. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lee in order to enable media content to be accessed, copied, and controlled in a secure manner in a network environment. (see Lee paragraph [0009], lines 2: " *... security and systems and methods that ensure that content is accessed, copied and controlled in secure ways in an electronic environment. ...*"; paragraph [0022], lines 11-13: " *... maintain content security a new system would require advanced techniques for detecting unauthorized copying of encrypted data....* ")

Regarding Claim 10, Stefik discloses a content reception device according to claim 9. (see Stefik col. 3, lines 58-63: media content and control information delivery system; col. 6, lines 41-42: error condition processing via messages) Stefik does not specifically disclose a content recording stop unit configured to stop the recording by the content recording unit. However, Lee disclose wherein a content recording stop unit configured to stop the recording by the content recording unit. However, Lee disclose wherein a content recording stop unit configured to stop the recording by the content recording unit with respect to the contents judged to have the output failure state by the output

failure information judgment unit. (see Lee paragraph [0449}, lines 5-9: stop recording based on error condition (i.e. output failure state))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stefik as taught by Lee to enable the capability for a content recording stop unit configured to stop the recording by the content recording unit. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lee in order to enable media content to be accessed, copied, and controlled in a secure manner in a network environment. (see Lee paragraph [0009], lines 2; paragraph [0022], lines 11-13)

Regarding Claim 12, Stefik discloses a content reception method according to claim 11. (see Stefik col. 3, lines 58-63: media content and control information delivery system; col. 6, lines 41-42: error condition processing via messages) Stefik does not specifically disclose recording the inputted contents, and recording the judgment result of the output failure information.

However, Lee discloses:

a) recording the inputted contents; (see Lee paragraph [0215], lines 2-6; paragraph [0221], lines 1-5; paragraph [0367], lines 16-17: record (i.e. copy, write) input media content) and

b) recording the judgment result of the output failure information in accordance with the recorded contents. (see Lee paragraph [0449], lines 4-8; paragraph [0453], lines 5-9: usage rights determination, failure state)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stefik as taught by Lee to enable the capability to record the inputted contents, and record the judgment result of the output failure information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lee in order to enable media content to be accessed, copied, and controlled in a secure manner in a network environment. (see Lee paragraph [0009], lines 2; paragraph [0022], lines 11-13)

Regarding Claim 13, Stefik discloses a content reception device according to claim 12. (see Stefik col. 3, lines 58-63: media content and control information delivery system; col. 6, lines 41-42: error condition processing via messages) Stefik does not specifically disclose stopping the recording of the contents judged to have the output failure state. However, Lee discloses wherein stopping the recording of the contents judged to have the output failure state. (see Lee paragraph [0449], lines 4-8; paragraph [0453], lines 5-9: usage rights determination, stop recording or failure state)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stefik as taught by Lee to enable the capability to stop the recording of the contents judged to have the output failure state. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lee in order to enable media content to be accessed, copied, and controlled in a secure manner in a network environment. (see Lee paragraph [0009], lines 2; paragraph [0022], lines 11-13)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlton Johnson whose telephone number is 571-270-1032. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nassar Moazzami, can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C.J.

Carlton Johnson
December 6, 2006

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

12/8/06